



CONGRESSIONAL HEARING RESUME

106th Congress

Date: 20 October 1999

SUBJECT: Hearing on Joint Experimentation

**COMMITTEE: Senate Armed Services Committee
Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities**

CHAIRMAN: The Honorable Pat Roberts

MEMBERS PRESENT (bold face):

REPUBLICANS

Bob Smith (NH)
Rick Santorum (PA)
Olympia Snowe (ME)
Jeff Sessions (AL)

DEMOCRATS

Jeff Bingaman (NM)
Edward Kennedy (MA)
Robert Byrd (WV)
Joseph Lieberman (CT)

OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT: None.

WITNESSES: PANEL 1
Adm Harold Gehman, USN, Commander in Chief, U.S. Joint Forces Command
Maj Gen George Close, USA, Director for Operational Plans and Interoperability (J7)

PANEL 2
Maj Gen Gerald Perryman, USAF, Commander, Aerospace Command and Control, and Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Center
Lt Gen Randy Rigby, USA, Deputy Commanding General, TRADOC
Lt Gen John Rhodes, USMC, Commanding General, Marine Corps Combat Development Command
VADM Arthur Cebrowski, President, Naval War College

Information contained in this resume was obtained during an open hearing. It will not be released outside of the Department of Defense (DoD) agencies until published hearing transcripts have been released by the Committee, and only to the extent it is in accord with published hearing procedures.

Prepared by: Maj Tom Henwood Date: 19 October 1999 Ext: 697-6790

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Subcommittee convened this hearing to receive testimony on the joint experimentation program and on Service-unique experimentation activities. The Members' main concern is their view that Service stovepipe systems continue to focus on a range of Service-unique issues at the expense of joint warfighting lessons learned. They are also concerned that we seem to re-learn the same lessons after each conflict. In general, DoD is not doing enough to spur transformation of our military capabilities. Testimony from CINCUSJFCOM and Service witnesses indicated that the Services are supporting JFCOM and their experimentation efforts are addressing joint warfighting challenges.

The Subcommittee was called to order at 1000.

OPENING REMARKS

Chairman Roberts

Sen Roberts is a strong supporter of the joint experimentation program and believes this program will provide the process necessary for the Department of Defense to identify and help provide solutions to outstanding joint warfighting deficiencies. He was dismayed to learn Joint Forces Command (JFC) had not been tasked with collating lessons learned from Kosovo, "one of the most extensive joint and combined exercises ever." He is also concerned about the transformation process within DoD. Sees an environment in which Service "stovepipe" systems continue to focus on a range of service unique issues at the expense of joint warfighting lessons learned. Concerns were confirmed recently when Joint Staff briefed the SASC on Kosovo lessons learned and volunteered that many of the lessons were remarkably similar to those learned during DESERT STORM (a specific example given was the ability to destroy mobile targets). Sen Roberts identified several long-standing deficiencies in the joint warfighting arena: challenge of attack operations against critical mobile targets; battlefield combat identification; common operating picture (COP); and information operations. The recently released report of the Defense Science Board, "DoD Warfighting Transformation," also notes many glaring deficiencies in the transformation arena: lack of a comprehensive department-wide strategy and roadmap to bring focus and discipline to transformation activities; metrics necessary to gauge progress and foster feedback do not exist; and robust processes necessary to translate promising results of joint warfighting experimentation into real capabilities is missing.

Sen Lieberman

Joint experimentation (JE) has come some distance since the early work of Sen Coats and myself. The recent change of Atlantic Command to Joint Forces Command is a significant one and a step in the right direction. Other positive steps include the Air Force's reorganization into AEFs and the Army's new vision. Primary purpose of JE is to keep the US militarily dominant well into the next century.

WITNESS STATEMENTS

PANEL 1

Adm Gehman

Joint experimentation has two purposes: maintain US superiority and prevent adversarial surprises. Without a catastrophe or huge failure, it will take strong leadership from the Congress and DoD to spur transformation. DoD has put in place the processes for transformation. Services are providing high quality officers to JFC.

Maj Gen Close

In the future we will fight in combined task forces in an interagency environment. The Joint Staff recognizes we must support JFCOM, the joint integration process, and full spectrum dominance.

PANEL 2

Maj Gen Perryman

The Air Force experimentation program must support modernization decisions that will help keep aerospace forces ready and more capable than the evolving threat. AF program ties ongoing and planned activities of our research labs, battle labs, wargaming community, and other key players towards common goal of building the EAF for the 21st century. AF Experimentation Campaign Plan, currently in draft, identifies the concepts that are the enabling difference between how we operate today and how the AF must operate in the future. It fully supports the concepts in the Joint Experimentation Plan. JEFX is the single AF event that brings many AF, sister services, business and industry, and joint initiatives together. Promising initiatives from first EFX in 1998 included B-1B datalink that successfully permitted retargeting enroute and prototype mission planning system. Both used effectively in Kosovo. Return of investment from experimentation is being realized in near-term capabilities for the joint warfighter. In mid-term, experimentation will permit the AF to fully validate the capabilities that support AF core competencies and joint warfighting concepts. For the long-term, experimentation will provide an orderly process of discovery that could reveal the RMA.

KEY COMMENTS, QUESTIONS, AND ANSWERS

PANEL 1

- **Sen Roberts** asked what internal DoD process changes might be required to institutionalize a viable JE program. **Adm Gehman** responded that the first process change was giving JE to a unified commander, which is the right level. Second process change is ongoing. The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and the Chairman of the JROC are currently looking at ensuring JFCOM has a “seat at the table” at the JROC. **Adm Gehman** recommended that the Congress give DoD a chance and hold off on any legislative changes.
- **Sen Roberts** remarked that Kosovo was a large joint experiment and asked why JFCOM had not been included in the effort to analyze Kosovo lessons learned. **Adm Gehman** answered that he was involved in OSD’s lessons learned process as one of

the CINCs. He sees Kosovo as a data point rather than a complete experiment but will look at the lessons learned. **Sen Roberts** then asked if he would be making any recommendations. **Adm Gehman** said he would break down the lessons learned into the nine JE areas and fold them into the work being accomplished by JFCOM.

- **Sen Lieberman** asked the admiral if he felt he had the necessary authority to oversee JE as envisioned by the sense of Congress. **Adm Gehman** responded that JFCOM was using its resources to leverage Service experimentation efforts. JCOM is also using the baseline assessments process and cited Attack Operations Against Critical Mobile Targets as an example.
- **Sen Lieberman** stated that there is a disparity between the funding JFCOM gets for experimentation and what the Services receive. Asked if all experimentation should fall under JFCOM. **Adm Gehman** responded that JFCOM is sufficiently resourced to lead JE efforts.
- **Sen Lieberman** asked if Adm Gehman's other responsibilities as a CINC detracted from his ability to fulfill his obligation to lead the JE effort. **Adm Gehman** said no, but that was something that should be reviewed every two years.
- **Sen Roberts** repeated the Defense Science Board's report finding that DoD lacks a process for transformation. **Adm Gehman** agreed and said that processes to capture and operationalize JFCOM's findings had not yet been determined.
- **Sen Lieberman** asked if the Congress should intervene to get JFCOM involved in the JROC process. **Adm Gehman** asked him to hold off and let DoD work it.
- **Sen Roberts** concluded Panel 1 by stating he is still not satisfied with JFCOM's role in analyzing Kosovo lessons learned and will press OSD on the issue.

PANEL 2

- **Sen Roberts** asked the witnesses to tell the subcommittee how much their Services spend on experimentation and what percentage is dedicated to joint warfighting challenges. **Maj Gen Perryman** offered that the Air Force spends \$240M and stressed that the figure included all concept development and experimentation activities, to include ACTDs, ATDs, modeling and simulation activities, wargaming, and large scale experiments. Virtually all of the money is focused on joint warfighting challenges. Other Service figures given were: Army--\$100M/year (20 to 30% related to joint interoperability issues); Marine Corps--\$44.6M/year (\$7.5M directly contributing to joint efforts); Navy--\$20-25M/year.
- **Sen Lieberman** noted that in his earlier testimony, Adm Gehman mentioned there were 45 overlapping efforts looking at Attack Operations Against Critical Mobile Targets. At some point, multiple centers of innovation become wasteful. Asked the Service witnesses to comment. **Maj Gen Perryman** said we need to leverage every dollar spent on experimentation. His role is to bring the acquisition and scientific communities and the operators together. **Lt Gen Rigby** said the answer is leadership—all the Services working under JFCOM's leadership will help solve the problem. **Adm Cebrowski** said collaboration is the key. There is also a need, though, for someone to "wear a black hat." He also offered the idea of having JFCOM certify Service units as being ready to participate in joint operations.
- Before concluding the hearing, **Sen Roberts** thanked the witnesses for their participation and indicated he may hold another hearing on this subject in six months.

The hearing was adjourned at 1235.